

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 have been examined, with all claims rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Subramanian et al. (US 2002/0015401; hereinafter "Subramanian"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Subramanian is assigned to the assignee of the present application, Infineon Technologies AG. This reference does not teach or even suggest the claimed channel CODEC processor having a processor core, as required by the claimed invention.

Before specifically explaining why the applied reference does not teach a channel CODEC processor having a processor core, Applicant first identifies corresponding figures in the application and Subramanian. As mentioned above, the application and Subramanian are both assigned to Infineon Technologies, and as a result the figures have similar layouts. Fig. 1 of the present application shows an electronic communication device, as does Figs. 1B of Subramanian. Each of these figures includes a configurable channel codec processor 104. Fig. 2 of the present application shows the details of the configurable channel codec processor 104, which includes the claimed processor core 210, 250; there is no such corresponding figure in Subramanian.

Contrary to the Examiner's statement on page 3 of the Office Action, Subramanian's allocator 219 and configuration info block 272 are not equivalent to the claimed processor core. Paragraphs 0030-0034 of the published application describe that the processor core 210, 250 not only controls and configures the hardware kernels connected to it, but also carries out processing functions on the data stream. In some applications, the processor core 210, 250 can even implement the entire CODEC function. On the other hand, allocator 219 in Fig. 2A and configuration info block 272 in Fig. 2D of Subramanian only control and configure the hardware kernels connected

to them. (See paragraphs 0061 and 0062); they do not perform any processing functions on the data stream. The claims are therefore patentable over the applied reference for at least this reason.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: November 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Laura C. Brutman

Laura C. Brutman

Registration No.: 38,395
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant